arXiv:1410.3031v3 [quant-ph] 2 Oct 2015

Near optimal bounds on quantum communication complexity of single-shot quantum state redistribution

Anurag Anshu
Centre for Quantum Technologies, National University of Singapore.
a0109169@u.nus.edu

Vamsi Krishna Devabathini
Centre for Quantum Technologies, National University of Singapore.
devabathini92@gmail.com

Rahul Jain
Centre for Quantum Technologies and Department of Computer Science, National University of Singapore.
MajuLab, CNRS-UNS-NUS-NTU International Joint Research Unit, UMI 3654, Singapore.
rahul@comp.nus.edu.sg

October 5, 2015

Abstract

We show near optimal bounds on the worst case quantum communication of single-shot entanglement-assisted one-way quantum communication protocols for the *quantum state redistribution* task and for the sub-tasks *quantum state splitting* and *quantum state merging*. Our bounds are tighter than previously known best bounds for the latter two sub-tasks.

A key technical tool that we use is a *convex-split* lemma which may be of independent interest.

1 Introduction

A fundamental quantum information theoretic primitive is the following quantum state redistribution task (please refer to Section 2 for definitions of various information theoretic quantities used in this section).

> Alice, Bob and Referee share a pure state $|\Psi\rangle_{RABC}$, with AC belonging to Alice, B to Bob and R to Referee. Alice wants to transfer the system C to Bob, such that the final state $\Phi_{RABC} \in \mathcal{B}^{\varepsilon}(\Psi_{RABC})$, for a given $\varepsilon \geq 0$.

This problem has been well studied in the literature both in the asymptotic and the single-shot settings (see e.g. [HOW07, DY08, Opp08, YBW08, YD09, Ber09, ADHW09, BRWW09, Dup10, BD10, BCR11, DH11, DBWR14, DHO14] and references therein). A special case of this task in which system A is not present is referred to as *quantum state merging* [HOW07]. Another special case when system B is not present is referred to as *quantum state splitting* [ADHW09]. In the asymptotic setting, it was shown by Devatak and Yard [DY08, YD09] (see also Luo and Devatak [LD09]) that the worst case communication per copy, using one-way communication and shared-entanglement, required for quantum state redistribution is tightly characterized by $\mathrm{I}(C:R|B)$ (the *conditional*

mutual information). Subsequently, it was shown by Oppenheim [Opp08] (see independent and related work [YBW08]) that quantum state redistribution can be realized with two applications of a protocol for quantum state merging.

Recently, in independent works by Berta, Christandl, Touchette [BCT14] and Datta, Hsieh, Oppenheim [DHO14], single-shot entanglement-assisted one-way protocols for quantum state redistribution have been proposed with the worst case communication upper bounded by:

$$\frac{1}{2}\left(\mathrm{H}^{\varepsilon}_{\max}(C|B)_{|\Psi\rangle_{RABC}} - \mathrm{H}^{\varepsilon}_{\min}(C|BR)_{|\Psi\rangle_{RABC}}\right) + \mathcal{O}\left(\log\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\right)\right).$$

These works[1] also provide several lower bounds with gaps between the upper and lower bounds and the question of closing these gaps has been left open in these works. The upper bound of [BCT14] and [DHO14] has recently been used by Touchette [Tou14] to obtain a *direct-sum result* for bounded-round entanglement-assisted quantum communication complexity.

Please note that state merging can be viewed as the 'time reversed' version of state splitting and hence both of them require the same communication. In [BCR11], Berta, Christandl, and Renner have provided upper and lower bounds for state splitting and state merging. We state them below for state splitting and same bounds (with A replaced by B) hold for state merging.

Theorem 1.1 ([BCR11])**.** *Let $|\Psi\rangle_{RAC}$ be a pure state. There exists an entanglement-assisted one-way state splitting protocol $\mathcal{P}$, which takes as input $|\Psi\rangle_{RAC}$ shared between two parties* Referee *(R) and* Alice *(AC), uses embezzling states as shared entanglement, and outputs a state Φ_{RAC} shared between* Referee *(R),* Bob *(C) and* Alice *(A) such that $\Phi_{RAC} \in \mathcal{B}^{3\varepsilon}(\Psi_{RAC})$. The communication cost of the protocol is upper bounded by*

$$\frac{1}{2}\mathrm{I}^{\varepsilon}_{\max}(R:C)_{\Psi_{RC}} + \log\log(|C|) + 4 + 2\left(\log\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\right)\right).$$

Furthermore, let $\mathcal{Q}$ be any entanglement-assisted one-way protocol (with communication from Alice *to* Bob*), which takes as input $|\Psi\rangle_{RAC}$ shared between two parties* Referee *(R) and* Alice *(AC) and outputs a state Φ_{RAC} shared between* Referee *(R),* Bob *(C) and* Alice *(A) such that $\Phi_{RAC} \in \mathcal{B}^{\varepsilon}(\Psi_{RAC})$. The number of qubits communicated by* Alice *to* Bob *in $\mathcal{Q}$ is lower bounded by,*

$$\frac{1}{2}\mathrm{I}^{\varepsilon}_{\max}(R:C)_{\Psi_{RC}}.$$

Our results

In this work, we obtain nearly tight upper and lower bounds on the worst case communication required by single-shot entanglement-assisted one-way protocols for quantum state redistribution. Following is the key information theoretic quantity that we define and consider.

Definition. Let $\varepsilon \geq 0$ and $|\Psi\rangle_{RABC}$ be a pure state. Define,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{Q}^{\varepsilon}_{|\Psi\rangle_{RABC}} &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \inf_{T,U_{BCT},\sigma'_T,\kappa_{RBCT}} \mathrm{I}_{\max}(RB:CT)_{\kappa_{RBCT}} \\ &= \inf_{T,U_{BCT},\sigma'_T,\sigma_{CT},\kappa_{RBCT}} \mathrm{D}_{\max}(\kappa_{RBCT}\|\kappa_{RB}\otimes\sigma_{CT})\end{aligned}$$

[1] It may be noted that these works and several others, optimize over *sub-normalized* states in their definitions of various information theoretic quantities, while in our definitions, we only optimize over normalized states. This changes the quantities up to an additive $\pm\varepsilon$ factor.

with the conditions $U_{BCT} \in \mathcal{U}(BCT), \sigma'_T \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}_T), \sigma_{CT} \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}_{CT})$ and

$$(I_R \otimes U_{BCT})\kappa_{RBCT}(I_R \otimes U^\dagger_{BCT}) \in \mathcal{B}^\varepsilon\left(\Psi_{RBC} \otimes \sigma'_T\right), \kappa_{RB} = \Psi_{RB}.$$

We show the following upper bound.

Theorem (Upper bound)**.** *Let $\varepsilon \in (0, 1/3)$ and $|\Psi\rangle_{RABC}$ be a pure state. There exists an entanglement-assisted one-way protocol $\mathcal{P}$, which takes as input $|\Psi\rangle_{RABC}$ shared between three parties* Referee *(R),* Bob *(B) and* Alice *(AC) and outputs a state Φ_{RABC} shared between* Referee *(R),* Bob *(BC) and* Alice *(A) such that $\Phi_{RABC} \in \mathcal{B}^{3\varepsilon}(\Psi_{RABC})$. If $\mathrm{Q}^\varepsilon_{|\Psi\rangle_{R,B,AC}} \leq \varepsilon^2/2$, there is no communication from* Alice *to* Bob *in $\mathcal{P}$. Otherwise the number of qubits communicated by* Alice *to* Bob *in $\mathcal{P}$ is upper bounded by:*

$$\frac{1}{2}\mathrm{Q}^\varepsilon_{|\Psi\rangle_{RABC}} + \log\log\left(\frac{4}{\varepsilon^2}\mathrm{Q}^\varepsilon_{|\Psi\rangle_{RABC}}\right) + \mathcal{O}\left(\log\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\right)\right).$$

We show the following lower bound.

Theorem (Lower bound)**.** *Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and $|\Psi\rangle_{RABC}$ be a pure state. Let $\mathcal{Q}$ be an entanglement-assisted one-way protocol (with communication from* Alice *to* Bob*), which takes as input $|\Psi\rangle_{RABC}$ shared between three parties* Referee *(R),* Bob *(B) and* Alice *(AC) and outputs a state Φ_{RABC} shared between* Referee *(R),* Bob *(BC) and* Alice *(A) such that $\Phi_{RABC} \in \mathcal{B}^\varepsilon(\Psi_{RABC})$. The number of qubits communicated by* Alice *to* Bob *in $\mathcal{Q}$ is lower bounded by:*

$$\frac{1}{2}\mathrm{Q}^\varepsilon_{|\Psi\rangle_{RABC}}.$$

As a corollary of the above we show the following upper and lower bounds for state splitting.

Corollary 1.2. *Let $\varepsilon \in (0, 1/3)$ and $|\Psi\rangle_{RAC}$ be a pure state. There exists an entanglement-assisted one-way protocol $\mathcal{P}$, which takes as input $|\Psi\rangle_{RAC}$ shared between two parties* Referee *(R) and* Alice *(AC) and outputs a state Φ_{RAC} shared between* Referee *(R),* Bob *(C) and* Alice *(A) such that $\Phi_{RAC} \in \mathcal{B}^{3\varepsilon}(\Psi_{RAC})$. If $\mathrm{I}^\varepsilon_{\max}(R:C)_{\Psi_{RC}} \leq \varepsilon^2/2$, then there is no communication from* Alice *to* Bob *in $\mathcal{P}$. Otherwise the number of qubits communicated by* Alice *to* Bob *in $\mathcal{P}$ is upper bounded by:*

$$\frac{1}{2}\mathrm{I}^\varepsilon_{\max}(R:C)_{\Psi_{RC}} + \log\log\left(\frac{4}{\varepsilon^2}\mathrm{I}^\varepsilon_{\max}(R:C)_{\Psi_{RC}}\right) + \mathcal{O}\left(\log\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\right)\right).$$

Furthermore, let $\mathcal{Q}$ be any entanglement-assisted one-way protocol (with communication from Alice *to* Bob*), which takes as input $|\Psi\rangle_{RAC}$ shared between two parties* Referee *(R) and* Alice *(AC) and outputs a state Φ_{RAC} shared between* Referee *(R),* Bob *(C) and* Alice *(A) such that $\Phi_{RAC} \in \mathcal{B}^\varepsilon(\Psi_{RAC})$. The number of qubits communicated by* Alice *to* Bob *in $\mathcal{Q}$ is lower bounded by,*

$$\frac{1}{2}\mathrm{I}^\varepsilon_{\max}(R:C)_{\Psi_{RC}}.$$

Same bounds hold for state merging.

Corollary 1.3. *Let $\varepsilon \in (0, 1/3)$ and $|\Psi\rangle_{RAC}$ be a pure state. There exists an entanglement-assisted one-way protocol $\mathcal{P}$, which takes as input $|\Psi\rangle_{RBC}$ shared between three parties* Referee *(R),* Alice *(C) and* Bob *(B) and outputs a state Φ_{RBC} shared between* Referee *(R) and* Bob *(BC) such that*

$\Phi_{RBC} \in \mathcal{B}^{3\varepsilon}(\Psi_{RBC})$. *If* $\mathrm{I}^{\varepsilon}_{\max}(R:C)_{\Psi_{RC}} \leq \varepsilon^2/2$, *then there is no communication from* Alice *to* Bob *in* $\mathcal{P}$. *Otherwise the number of qubits communicated by* Alice *to* Bob *in* $\mathcal{P}$ *is upper bounded by:*

$$\frac{1}{2}\mathrm{I}^{\varepsilon}_{\max}(R:C)_{\Psi_{RC}} + \log\log\left(\frac{4}{\varepsilon^2}\mathrm{I}^{\varepsilon}_{\max}(R:C)_{\Psi_{RC}}\right) + \mathcal{O}\left(\log\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\right)\right).$$

Furthermore, let $\mathcal{Q}$ *be any entanglement-assisted one-way protocol (with communication from* Alice *to* Bob*), which takes as input* $|\Psi\rangle_{RBC}$ *shared between three parties* Referee (R), Alice (C) *and* Bob (B), *and outputs a state* Φ_{RBC} *shared between* Referee (R) *and* Bob (BC), *such that* $\Phi_{RBC} \in \mathcal{B}^{\varepsilon}(\Psi_{RBC})$ *The number of qubits communicated by* Alice *to* Bob *in* $\mathcal{Q}$ *is lower bounded by,*

$$\frac{1}{2}\mathrm{I}^{\varepsilon}_{\max}(R:C)_{\Psi_{RC}}.$$

Please note that our bounds above are an improvement over the bounds of Berta, Christandl, and Renner [BCR11]] as stated in Theorem 1.1 since $\mathrm{I}^{\varepsilon}_{\max}(R:C)_{\Psi_{RC}} \leq 2\log|C|$ (Fact 2.9).

Our techniques

Central to our approach for the upper bound is the following convex-split lemma. This lemma may be of independent interest.

Lemma (Convex-split lemma)**.** *Let* ρ_{PQ} *be a state on two registers* P, Q. *Let* σ_Q *be a state on register* Q. *Let* $k \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathrm{D}_{\max}(\rho_{PQ}\|\rho_P \otimes \sigma_Q)$, $\delta \in (0, 1/6)$. *If* $k \leq 3\delta$ *let* $n \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 1$, *else let* $n \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{8\cdot 2^k \cdot \log(k/\delta)}{\delta^3}$. *Define the following state (please also refer to Figure 1),*

$$\tau_{PQ_1Q_2\ldots Q_n} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n} \rho_{PQ_j} \otimes \sigma_{Q_1} \otimes \ldots \otimes \sigma_{Q_{j-1}} \otimes \sigma_{Q_{j+1}} \otimes \ldots \otimes \sigma_{Q_n}, \tag{1}$$

on $n+1$ *registers* $P, Q_1, Q_2 \ldots Q_n$. *Then,*

$$\mathrm{I}(P:Q_1Q_2\ldots Q_n)_{\tau} \leq 3\delta \quad \text{and} \quad \mathrm{F}^2(\tau_P \otimes \tau_{Q_1Q_2\ldots Q_n}, \tau_{PQ_1Q_2\ldots Q_n}) \geq 1 - 6\delta.$$

We use this lemma for state redistribution as follows. Suppose Alice and Referee share a pure state ρ_{PAQ} with Alice holding registers AQ and Referee holding register P. Their objective is that Referee and Bob together end up with ρ_{PQ}. Let $|\theta\rangle_{SQ_1\ldots Q_n}$ be a purification of $\tau_{Q_1Q_2\ldots Q_n}$ with Alice holding register S and Bob holding registers $Q_1 \ldots Q_n$. Let $\delta > 0$ be small. Since $\tau_P \otimes \tau_{Q_1Q_2\ldots Q_n}$ and $\tau_{PQ_1Q_2\ldots Q_n}$ are close states and $\tau_P = \rho_P$, the state $\rho_{PAQ} \otimes |\theta\rangle\langle\theta|_{SQ_1\ldots Q_n}$ can be thought of as (nearly) a purification of $\tau_{PQ_1Q_2\ldots Q_n}$. Alice does appropriate measurement on her registers to realize the convex split as in Eq. (1). After this, Alice tells Bob $j \in [n]$ (employing *super-dense coding* using fresh entanglement) indicating which state in the convex split has occurred. Bob then picks up the register Q_j to obtain the state ρ_{PQ_j} jointly between Referee and Bob. The number of qubits communicated by Alice is

$$\frac{\log(n)}{2} \leq \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{D}_{\max}(\rho_{PQ}\|\rho_P \otimes \sigma_Q) + \log\log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\mathrm{D}_{\max}(\rho_{PQ}\|\rho_P \otimes \sigma_Q)\right) + \mathcal{O}\left(\log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right)\right).$$

The precise arguments for our upper bound appear in the proof of Theorem 4.2 (in which P also involves Bob's register B).



Figure 1: Convex split

To show our lower bound we sketch a general form of any entanglement-assisted one-way protocol for state-redistribution. The unitary transformations, number of qubits transferred and shared registers appearing in such a protocol correspond to the quantities that have been used in the definition of $Q^{\varepsilon}_{|\Psi\rangle_{RABC}}$. Precise argument appear in the proof of Theorem 4.3.

Protocols similar in spirit to ours, however for classical-quantum states, have appeared previously for example in [JRS02, JRS05, JRS08, AJM$^+$14].

Organization

In Section 2 we present some definitions, facts and lemmas that are needed for our proofs. In Section 3, we state and prove the convex-split lemma. In Section 4 we prove the upper and lower bounds on communication for state redistribution. We prove the communication bounds for state splitting and state merging in Section 5. In Section 6, we relate our bound to other known bounds in both one shot and asymptotic setting. In Section 7, we consider the question of recovery of quantum state, which has received considerable attention recently (see references in the section). We conclude with some miscellaneous discussion and open questions in Section 7.

2 Preliminaries

In this section we present some notations, definitions, facts and lemmas that we will use later in our proofs. Readers may refer to [CT91, NC00, Wat11] for good introduction to classical and quantum information theory.

Information theory

For a natural number n, let $[n]$ represent the set $\{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$. We let log represent logarithm to the base 2 and ln represent logarithm to the base e. The ℓ_1 norm of an operator X is $\|X\|_1 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathrm{Tr}\sqrt{X^\dagger X}$ and ℓ_2 norm is $\|X\|_2 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sqrt{\mathrm{Tr} X X^\dagger}$. A quantum state (or just a state) is a positive semi-definite matrix with trace equal to 1. It is called *pure* if and only if the rank is 1. Let $|\psi\rangle$ be a unit vector. We use ψ to represent the state and also the density matrix $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$, associated with $|\psi\rangle$.

A sub-normalized state is a positive semidefinite matrix with trace less than or equal to 1. A *quantum register* A is associated with some Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_A$. Define $|A| \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \dim(\mathcal{H}_A)$. We denote by $\mathcal{D}(A)$, the set of quantum states in the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_A$. State ρ with subscript A indicates $\rho_A \in \mathcal{D}(A)$.

For two quantum states ρ and σ, $\rho \otimes \sigma$ represents the tensor product (Kronecker product) of ρ and σ. Composition of two registers A and B, denoted AB, is associated with Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B$. If two registers A, B are associated with the same Hilbert space, we shall denote it by $A \equiv B$. Let ρ_{AB} be a bipartite quantum state in registers AB. We define

$$\rho_B \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathrm{Tr}_A(\rho_{AB}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_i (\langle i| \otimes \mathbb{1}_B)\rho_{AB}(|i\rangle \otimes \mathbb{1}_B),$$

where $\{|i\rangle\}_i$ is an orthonormal basis for the Hilbert space A and $\mathbb{1}_B$ is the identity matrix in space B. The state ρ_B is referred to as the marginal state of ρ_{AB} in register B. Unless otherwise stated, a missing register from subscript in a state will represent partial trace over that register. A quantum *super-operator (a.k.a quantum map a.k.a quantum operation)* $\mathcal{E} : A \to B$ is a completely positive and trace preserving (CPTP) linear map (mapping states from $\mathcal{D}(A)$ to states in $\mathcal{D}(B)$). The identity operator in Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_A$ (and associated register A) is denoted I_A. A *unitary* operator $U_A : \mathcal{H}_A \to \mathcal{H}_A$ is such that $U_A^\dagger U_A = U_A U_A^\dagger = I_A$. An *isometry* $V : \mathcal{H}_A \to \mathcal{H}_B$ is such that $V^\dagger V = I_A$ and $VV^\dagger = I_B$. The set of all unitary operations on register A is denoted by $\mathcal{U}(A)$.

Definition 2.1. We shall consider the following information theoretic quantities. Reader is referred to [TCR10, Tom12, Dat09] for many of these definitions. We consider only normalized states in the definitions below. Let $\varepsilon \geq 0$.

1. **fidelity**
$$\mathrm{F}(\rho, \sigma) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left\|\sqrt{\rho}\sqrt{\sigma}\right\|_1.$$

2. **purified distance**
$$\mathcal{P}(\rho, \sigma) = \sqrt{1 - \mathrm{F}^2(\rho, \sigma)}.$$

3. **ε-ball**
$$\mathcal{B}^\varepsilon(\rho_A) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\rho'_A \in \mathcal{D}(A) |\ \mathcal{P}(\rho_A, \rho'_A) \leq \varepsilon\}.$$

4. **entropy**
$$\mathrm{H}(A)_\rho \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} -\mathrm{Tr}(\rho_A \log \rho_A).$$

5. **relative entropy**
$$\mathrm{D}(\rho\|\sigma) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathrm{Tr}(\rho \log \rho) - \mathrm{Tr}(\rho \log \sigma).$$

6. **max-relative entropy**

$$\mathrm{D}_{\max}(\rho\|\sigma) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \inf\{\lambda \in \mathbb{R} : 2^{\lambda}\sigma \geq \rho\}.$$

7. **mutual information**

$$\mathrm{I}(A:B)_{\rho} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathrm{D}(\rho_{AB}\|\rho_A \otimes \rho_B) = \mathrm{H}(A)_{\rho} + \mathrm{H}(B)_{\rho} - \mathrm{H}(AB)_{\rho}\,.$$

8. **conditional mutual information**

$$\mathrm{I}(A:B|C)_{\rho} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathrm{I}(A:BC)_{\rho} - \mathrm{I}(A:C)_{\rho} = \mathrm{I}(B:AC)_{\rho} - \mathrm{I}(B:C)_{\rho}\,.$$

9. **max-information**

$$\mathrm{I}_{\max}(A:B)_{\rho} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \inf_{\sigma_B \in \mathcal{D}(B)} \mathrm{D}_{\max}(\rho_{AB}\|\rho_A \otimes \sigma_B)\,.$$

10. **smooth max-information**

$$\mathrm{I}^{\varepsilon}_{\max}(A:B)_{\rho} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \inf_{\rho' \in \mathcal{B}^{\varepsilon}(\rho)} \mathrm{I}_{\max}(A:B)_{\rho'}\,.$$

11. **conditional min-entropy**

$$\mathrm{H}_{\min}(A|B)_{\rho} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} -\inf_{\sigma_B \in \mathcal{D}(B)} \mathrm{D}_{\max}(\rho_{AB}\|I_A \otimes \sigma_B)\,.$$

12. **conditional max-entropy**

$$\mathrm{H}_{\max}(A|B)_{\rho_{AB}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} -\mathrm{H}_{\min}(A|R)_{\rho_{AR}}\,,$$

where ρ_{ABR} is a purification of ρ_{AB} for some system R.

13. **smooth conditional min-entropy**

$$\mathrm{H}^{\varepsilon}_{\min}(A|B)_{\rho} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sup_{\rho' \in \mathcal{B}^{\varepsilon}(\rho)} \mathrm{H}_{\min}(A|B)_{\rho'}\,.$$

14. **smooth conditional max-entropy**

$$\mathrm{H}^{\varepsilon}_{\max}(A|B)_{\rho} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \inf_{\rho' \in \mathcal{B}^{\varepsilon}(\rho)} \mathrm{H}_{\max}(A|B)_{\rho'}\,.$$

15. **fidelity of recovery**([SW14])

$$\mathrm{F}(A:C|B)_{\rho_{ABC}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sup_{\mathcal{E}:B\to BC} \mathrm{F}(\rho_{ABC}, \mathcal{E}(\rho_{AB}))\,.$$

We will use the following facts.

Fact 2.2 (Triangle inequality for purified distance, [Tom12])**.** For states ρ_1, ρ_2, ρ_3,

$$\mathcal{P}(\rho_1, \rho_3) \leq \mathcal{P}(\rho_1, \rho_2) + \mathcal{P}(\rho_2, \rho_3).$$

Fact 2.3 (Uhlmann's theorem)**.** [[NC00], Theorem 9.4] Let ρ_A and σ_A be two quantum states in a register A. Let $|\rho\rangle_{AB}$ be a purification of ρ_A and $|\sigma\rangle_{AC}$ be a purification of σ_A. There exists an isometry $V : \mathcal{H}_C \to \mathcal{H}_B$ such that,

$$\mathrm{F}(|\theta\rangle\langle\theta|_{AB}, |\rho\rangle\langle\rho|_{AB}) = \mathrm{F}(\rho_A, \sigma_A),$$

where $|\theta\rangle_{AB} = (I_A \otimes V)|\sigma\rangle_{AC}$.

Fact 2.4 (Stinespring representation)**.** [[Wat11], Theorem 5.3] Let $\mathcal{E}(\cdot) : A \to B$ be a quantum operation. There exists a Hilbert space C and an unitary $U : A \otimes B \otimes C \to A \otimes B \otimes C$ such that $\mathcal{E}(\omega) = \mathrm{Tr}_{A,C}\left(U(\omega \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|_{B,C})U^\dagger\right)$.

Fact 2.5 (Quantum operations do not increase distance)**.** [[Wat11], Theorem 11.6, [NC00],page 406, 414] For states ρ, σ, and quantum operation $\mathcal{E}(\cdot)$,

$$\|\mathcal{E}(\rho) - \mathcal{E}(\sigma)\|_1 \leq \|\rho - \sigma\|_1, \mathrm{D}(\mathcal{E}(\rho)\|\mathcal{E}(\sigma)) \leq \mathrm{D}(\rho\|\sigma) \text{ and } \mathrm{F}(\rho, \sigma) \leq \mathrm{F}(\mathcal{E}(\rho), \mathcal{E}(\sigma)).$$

In particular, for bipartite states ρ_{AB} and σ_{AB},

$$\|\rho_A - \sigma_A\|_1 \leq \|\rho_{AB} - \sigma_{AB}\|_1, \mathrm{D}(\rho_A\|\sigma_A) \leq \mathrm{D}(\rho_{AB}\|\sigma_{AB}) \text{ and } \mathrm{F}(\rho_{AB}, \sigma_{AB}) \leq \mathrm{F}(\rho_A, \sigma_A).$$

Fact 2.6. For quantum states ρ, σ, τ such that $\mathrm{D}_{\max}(\rho\|\sigma) = 2k$, $\mathrm{F}(\tau, \rho) \leq 2^k \mathrm{F}(\tau, \sigma)$.

Fact 2.7. For a quantum states ρ, σ,

$$\mathrm{D}_{\max}(\rho\|\sigma) \geq \mathrm{D}(\rho\|\sigma).$$

Fact 2.8. For a quantum state ρ_{AB},

$$\mathrm{I}(A : B)_\rho = \inf_{\sigma_B} \mathrm{D}(\rho_{AB}\|\rho_A \otimes \sigma_B) = \mathrm{D}(\rho_{AB}\|\rho_A \otimes \rho_B).$$

Fact 2.9 ([BCR11], Lemma B.7)**.** For a quantum state ρ_{AB},

$$\mathrm{I}_{\max}(A : B)_\rho \leq 2 \cdot \min\{\log|A|, \log|B|\}.$$

Fact 2.10 ([BCR11], Lemma B.14)**.** For a quantum state ρ_{ABC},

$$\mathrm{I}_{\max}(A : BC)_\rho \geq \mathrm{I}_{\max}(A : B)_\rho.$$

Fact 2.11 (Pinsker's inequality)**.** [[DCHR78]] For quantum states ρ and σ,

$$\mathrm{F}(\rho, \sigma) \geq 2^{-\frac{1}{2}\mathrm{D}(\rho\|\sigma)}.$$

This implies,

$$1 - \mathrm{F}(\rho, \sigma) \leq \frac{\ln 2}{2} \cdot \mathrm{D}(\rho\|\sigma) \leq \mathrm{D}(\rho\|\sigma).$$

Fact 2.12 (Joint convexity of relative entropy)**.** [[Wat11], Theorem 11.2] Let $\rho^0, \rho^1, \sigma^0, \sigma^1$ be quantum states and let $\lambda \in [0, 1]$. Then

$$\mathrm{D}\left(\lambda\rho^0 + (1-\lambda)\rho^1 \middle\| \lambda\sigma^0 + (1-\lambda)\sigma^1\right) \leq \lambda \mathrm{D}\left(\rho^0 \middle\| \sigma^0\right) + (1-\lambda)\mathrm{D}\left(\rho^1 \middle\| \sigma^1\right).$$

Fact 2.13 (Chernoff bounds)**.** Let $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ be independent random variables, with each $X_i \in [0,1]$ always. Let $X \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} X_1 + \cdots + X_n$ and $\mu \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbb{E}[X] = \mathbb{E}[X_1] + \cdots + \mathbb{E}[X_n]$. Then for any $0 \leq \varepsilon \leq 1$,

$$\Pr[X \geq (1+\varepsilon)\mu] \leq \exp\left(-\frac{\varepsilon^2}{3}\mu\right)$$
$$\Pr[X \leq (1-\varepsilon)\mu] \leq \exp\left(-\frac{\varepsilon^2}{2}\mu\right).$$

We will need the following lemmas.

Lemma 2.14 ([NC00], Equation 11.135)**.** *Let p and q be probability distributions on $[m]$. Let $\rho \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{x=1}^m p(x)\rho_x$ and $\sigma \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{x=1}^m q(x)\sigma_x$. Then $\mathrm{D}(\rho\|\sigma) \leq \mathrm{D}(p\|q) + \sum_{x=1}^m p(x)\mathrm{D}(\rho_x\|\sigma_x)$.*

Proof. Define $\rho' \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{x=1}^m p(x)\rho_x \otimes |x\rangle\langle x|$ and $\sigma' \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{x=1}^m q(x)\sigma_x \otimes |x\rangle\langle x|$. Consider,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{D}(\rho\|\sigma) &\leq \mathrm{D}(\rho'\|\sigma') \quad \text{(Fact 2.5)} \\
&= \sum_x p(x) \cdot \mathrm{Tr}(\rho_x \otimes |x\rangle\langle x|)(\log \rho' - \log \sigma') \\
&= \sum_x p(x) \left[\log(p(x)) + \mathrm{Tr}\rho_x \log(\rho_x) - \log(q(x)) - \mathrm{Tr}(\rho_x \log(\sigma_x))\right] \\
&= \sum_x p(x) \log\left(\frac{p(x)}{q(x)}\right) + \sum_x p(x)\mathrm{D}(\rho_x\|\sigma_x) \\
&= \mathrm{D}(p\|q) + \sum_x p(x)\mathrm{D}(\rho_x\|\sigma_x).
\end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 2.15. *Let $\epsilon > 0$. Let $|\psi\rangle_A$ be a pure state and let ρ_{AB} be a state such that $\mathrm{F}(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|_A, \rho_A) \geq 1-\varepsilon$. There exists a state θ_B such that $\mathrm{F}(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|_A \otimes \theta_B, \rho_{AB}) \geq 1-\varepsilon$.*

Proof. Let $|\rho\rangle_{ABC}$ be a purification of ρ_{AB}. From Fact 2.3 we get a pure state θ_{BC} such that

$$\begin{aligned}
1-\varepsilon &\leq \mathrm{F}(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|_A, \rho_A) \\
&= \mathrm{F}(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|_A \otimes |\theta\rangle\langle\theta|_{BC}, |\rho\rangle\langle\rho|_{ABC}) \\
&\leq \mathrm{F}(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|_A \otimes \theta_B, \rho_{AB}). \quad \text{(Fact 2.5)}
\end{aligned}$$

□

3 A convex-split lemma

Following is our key lemma. It may be of independent interest.

Lemma 3.1 (Convex-split lemma)**.** *Let ρ_{PQ} be a state on two registers P, Q. Let σ_Q be a state on register Q. Let $\delta \in (0, 1/6)$ and $k \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathrm{D}_{\max}(\rho_{PQ}\|\rho_P \otimes \sigma_Q)$. If $k \leq 3\delta$ let $n \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 1$, else let $n \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{8 \cdot 2^k \cdot \log(k/\delta)}{\delta^3}$. Define the following state (please also refer to Figure 1),*

$$\tau_{PQ_1Q_2\ldots Q_n} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n \rho_{PQ_j} \otimes \sigma_{Q_1} \otimes \ldots \otimes \sigma_{Q_{j-1}} \otimes \sigma_{Q_{j+1}} \otimes \ldots \otimes \sigma_{Q_n},$$

on $n+1$ registers $P, Q_1, Q_2 \dots Q_n$, where $\forall j \in [n] : \rho_{PQ_j} = \rho_{PQ}$. Then,

$$\mathrm{I}(P : Q_1 Q_2 \dots Q_n)_\tau \leq 3\delta \quad \text{and} \quad \mathrm{F}^2(\tau_P \otimes \tau_{Q_1 Q_2 \dots Q_n}, \tau_{PQ_1 Q_2 \dots Q_n}) \geq 1 - 6\delta.$$

Proof. If $\mathrm{D}_{\max}(\rho_{PQ} \| \rho_P \otimes \sigma_Q) \leq 3\delta$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{I}(P : Q_1)_\tau &= \mathrm{I}(P : Q)_\rho \\
&= \mathrm{D}(\rho_{PQ} \| \rho_P \otimes \rho_Q) \\
&\leq \mathrm{D}(\rho_{PQ} \| \rho_P \otimes \sigma_Q) \quad \text{(Fact 2.8)} \\
&\leq \mathrm{D}_{\max}(\rho_{PQ} \| \rho_P \otimes \sigma_Q) \quad \text{(Fact 2.7)} \\
&\leq 3\delta.
\end{aligned}$$

Otherwise assume $k > 3\delta$. Since $k = \mathrm{D}_{\max}(\rho_{PQ} \| \rho_P \otimes \sigma_Q)$, we have $\rho_{PQ} \leq 2^k (\rho_P \otimes \sigma_Q)$. Let

$$\rho_P \otimes \sigma_Q = 2^{-k} \rho_{PQ} + (1 - 2^{-k}) \rho'_{PQ},$$

for some state ρ'_{PQ}. This implies, $\sigma_Q = 2^{-k} \rho_Q + (1 - 2^{-k}) \rho'_Q$. For this proof, it is convenient to call ρ_Q as ρ_Q^1 and ρ'_Q as ρ_Q^0. Define,

$$\sigma^{-j} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sigma_{Q_1} \otimes \dots \otimes \sigma_{Q_{j-1}} \otimes \sigma_{Q_{j+1}} \otimes \dots \otimes \sigma_{Q_n}.$$

Note that $\tau_P = \rho_P$. Consider,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathrm{I}(P : Q_1 Q_2 \dots Q_n)_\tau \\
&= \mathrm{H}(P)_\tau + \mathrm{H}(Q_1 Q_2 \dots Q_n)_\tau - \mathrm{H}(P Q_1 Q_2 \dots Q_n)_\tau \\
&= -\mathrm{Tr}(\rho_P \log(\rho_P)) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \mathrm{Tr}((\rho_{Q_j} \otimes \sigma^{-j}) \log(\tau_{Q_1 Q_2 \dots Q_n})) + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \mathrm{Tr}((\rho_{PQ_j} \otimes \sigma^{-j}) \log(\tau_{PQ_1 Q_2 \dots Q_n})) \\
&= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \left(\mathrm{D}\left(\rho_{PQ_j} \otimes \sigma^{-j} \middle\| \rho_P \otimes \tau_{Q_1 Q_2 \dots Q_n}\right) - \mathrm{D}\left(\rho_{PQ_j} \otimes \sigma^{-j} \middle\| \tau_{PQ_1 Q_2 \dots Q_n}\right) \right) \\
&\leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \left(\mathrm{D}\left(\rho_{PQ_j} \otimes \sigma^{-j} \middle\| \rho_P \otimes \tau_{Q_1 Q_2 \dots Q_n}\right) - \mathrm{D}\left(\rho_{PQ_j} \middle\| \tau_{PQ_j}\right) \right) \quad \text{(Fact 2.5)} \\
&= \mathrm{D}\left(\rho_{PQ_n} \otimes \sigma_{Q_1} \otimes \dots \otimes \sigma_{Q_{n-1}} \middle\| \rho_P \otimes \tau_{Q_1 Q_2 \dots Q_n}\right) - \mathrm{D}(\rho_{PQ_n} \| \tau_{PQ_n}). \qquad (2)
\end{aligned}$$

The last equality above comes from the symmetry of τ under interchange of any two registers Q_i, Q_j. Observe that

$$\tau_{PQ_n} = \frac{1}{n} \rho_{PQ_n} + \frac{n-1}{n} \rho_P \otimes \sigma_{Q_n}.$$

Since $\rho_{PQ_n} \leq 2^k (\rho_P \otimes \sigma_{Q_n})$, we have

$$\tau_{PQ_n} \leq \left(1 + \frac{2^k}{n}\right) (\rho_P \otimes \sigma_{Q_n}).$$

This implies, using operator monotonicity of log,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{D}(\rho_{PQ_n} \| \tau_{PQ_n}) &= \mathrm{Tr} \rho_{PQ_n} \log(\rho_{PQ_n}) - \mathrm{Tr} \rho_{PQ_n} \log(\tau_{PQ_n}) \\
&\geq \mathrm{Tr} \rho_{PQ_n} \log(\rho_{PQ_n}) - \mathrm{Tr} \rho_{PQ_n} \log\left(\left(1 + \frac{2^k}{n}\right) (\rho_P \otimes \sigma_{Q_n})\right) \\
&= \mathrm{D}(\rho_{PQ_n} \| \rho_P \otimes \sigma_{Q_n}) - \log\left(1 + \frac{2^k}{n}\right). \qquad (3)
\end{aligned}$$

For a string $s \in \{0,1\}^{n-1}$, define (below $|s|$ represents the number of 1s in s),

$$\tau(s) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{2^{-k|s|}(1-2^{-k})^{n-1-|s|}}{n}(|s|2^k+1) \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma(s) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 2^{-k|s|}(1-2^{-k})^{n-1-|s|}.$$

Observe that,

$$\tau_{Q_1\ldots Q_n} = \sum_{s\in\{0,1\}^{n-1}} \tau(s)\cdot \rho_{Q_1}^{s_1}\otimes\ldots\otimes\rho_{Q_{n-1}}^{s_{n-1}}\otimes\left(\frac{2^{-k}\rho_{Q_n}+|s|\sigma_{Q_n}}{2^{-k}+|s|}\right)$$
$$\sigma_{Q_1}\otimes\ldots\otimes\sigma_{Q_{n-1}} = \sum_{s\in\{0,1\}^{n-1}} \sigma(s)\cdot \rho_{Q_1}^{s_1}\otimes\ldots\otimes\rho_{Q_{n-1}}^{s_{n-1}}.$$

Consider,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathrm{D}\left(\rho_{PQ_n}\otimes\sigma_{Q_1}\ldots\sigma_{Q_{n-1}}\middle\|\rho_P\otimes\tau_{Q_1Q_2\ldots Q_n}\right)\\
&\leq \sum_{s\in\{0,1\}^{n-1}}\sigma(s)\log\left(\frac{\sigma(s)}{\tau(s)}\right)+\sum_{s\in\{0,1\}^{n-1}}\sigma(s)\mathrm{D}\left(\rho_{PQ_n}\middle\|\rho_P\otimes\left(\frac{2^{-k}\rho_{Q_n}+|s|\sigma_{Q_n}}{2^{-k}+|s|}\right)\right) \quad \text{(Lemma 2.14)}\\
&\leq \left(\sum_{s\in\{0,1\}^{n-1}}\sigma(s)\log\left(\frac{\sigma(s)}{\tau(s)}\right)\right)+\mathrm{D}(\rho_{PQ_n}\|\rho_P\otimes\sigma_{Q_n}) \quad \text{(Fact 2.8 and Fact 2.12)}\\
&= \left(\sum_{s\in\{0,1\}^{n-1}}\sigma(s)\log\left(\frac{n}{|s|2^k+1}\right)\right)+\mathrm{D}(\rho_{PQ_n}\|\rho_P\otimes\sigma_{Q_n})\\
&= \mathrm{D}(\rho_{PQ_n}\|\rho_P\otimes\sigma_{Q_n})+\sum_{s:|s|\geq\frac{n-1}{2^k}(1-\delta)}\sigma(s)\log\left(\frac{n}{|s|2^k+1}\right)+\sum_{s:|s|<\frac{n-1}{2^k}(1-\delta)}\sigma(s)\log\left(\frac{n}{|s|2^k+1}\right)\\
&\leq \mathrm{D}(\rho_{PQ_n}\|\rho_P\otimes\sigma_{Q_n})+\log(\frac{1}{1-\delta})+\sum_{s:|s|<\frac{n-1}{2^k}(1-\delta)}\sigma(s)\log\left(\frac{n}{|s|2^k+1}\right)\\
&\leq \mathrm{D}(\rho_{PQ_n}\|\rho_P\otimes\sigma_{Q_n})+\log\left(\frac{1}{1-\delta}\right)+\sum_{s:|s|<\frac{n-1}{2^k}(1-\delta)}\sigma(s)\log(n)\\
&\leq \mathrm{D}(\rho_{PQ_n}\|\rho_P\otimes\sigma_{Q_n})+\log\left(\frac{1}{1-\delta}\right)+\log(n)\cdot\exp\left(\frac{-\delta^2\cdot 2^{-k}\cdot(n-1)}{2}\right) \quad \text{(Fact 2.13)} \qquad (4)
\end{aligned}$$

Recall that $k > 3\delta$. Combining, Eqs. (2), (3), (4) and choice of n, we get,

$$\mathrm{I}(P:Q_1Q_2\ldots Q_n)_\tau \leq \log\left(\frac{1}{1-\delta}\right)+\log(n)\cdot\exp\left(\frac{-\delta^2\cdot 2^{-k}\cdot(n-1)}{2}\right)+\log\left(1+\frac{2^k}{n}\right)\leq 3\delta.$$

This implies,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{F}(\tau_P\otimes\tau_{Q_1Q_2\ldots Q_n},\tau_{PQ_1Q_2\ldots Q_n}) &\geq 1-\mathrm{D}(\tau_{PQ_1Q_2\ldots Q_n}\|\tau_P\otimes\tau_{Q_1Q_2\ldots Q_n}) \quad \text{(Fact 2.11)}\\
&= 1-\mathrm{I}(P:Q_1Q_2\ldots Q_n)_\tau \quad \text{(Fact 2.8)}\\
&\geq 1-3\delta.
\end{aligned}$$

And hence,

$$\mathrm{F}^2(\tau_P\otimes\tau_{Q_1Q_2\ldots Q_n},\tau_{PQ_1Q_2\ldots Q_n})\geq(1-3\delta)^2\geq 1-6\delta.$$

□

4 Communication bounds on state redistribution

Upper bound

We begin with the following definition.

Definition 4.1. Let $\varepsilon \geq 0$ and $|\Psi\rangle_{RABC}$ be a pure state. Define,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Q}^{\varepsilon}_{|\Psi\rangle_{RABC}} &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \inf_{T,U_{BCT},\sigma'_T,\kappa_{RBCT}} \mathrm{I}_{\max}(RB:CT)_{\kappa_{RBCT}} \\ &= \inf_{T,U_{BCT},\sigma'_T,\sigma_{CT},\kappa_{RBCT}} \mathrm{D}_{\max}(\kappa_{RBCT} \| \kappa_{RB} \otimes \sigma_{CT}) \end{aligned}$$

with the conditions $U_{BCT} \in \mathcal{U}(BCT), \sigma'_T \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}_T), \sigma_{CT} \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}_{CT})$ and

$$(I_R \otimes U_{BCT})\kappa_{RBCT}(I_R \otimes U^{\dagger}_{BCT}) \in \mathcal{B}^{\varepsilon}\left(\Psi_{RBC} \otimes \sigma'_T\right), \kappa_{RB} = \Psi_{RB}.$$

We show the following upper bound on communication cost of quantum state redistribution.

Theorem 4.2 (Upper bound)**.** *Let $\varepsilon \in (0, 1/3)$ and $|\Psi\rangle_{RABC}$ be a pure state. There exists an entanglement-assisted one-way protocol $\mathcal{P}$, which takes as input $|\Psi\rangle_{RABC}$ shared between three parties* Referee (R), Bob (B) *and* Alice (AC) *and outputs a state Φ_{RABC} shared between* Referee (R), Bob (BC) *and* Alice (A) *such that $\Phi_{RABC} \in \mathcal{B}^{2\varepsilon}(\Psi_{RABC})$. If $\mathrm{Q}^{\varepsilon}_{|\Psi\rangle_{R,B,AC}} \leq \varepsilon^2/2$, there is no communication from* Alice *to* Bob *in $\mathcal{P}$. Otherwise the number of qubits communicated by* Alice *to* Bob *in $\mathcal{P}$ is upper bounded by:*

$$\frac{1}{2}\mathrm{Q}^{\varepsilon}_{|\Psi\rangle_{RABC}} + \log\log\left(\frac{4}{\varepsilon^2}\mathrm{Q}^{\varepsilon}_{|\Psi\rangle_{RABC}}\right) + \mathcal{O}\left(\log\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\right)\right).$$

Proof. We assume for simplicity that the inf in the definition of $\mathrm{Q}^{\varepsilon}_{|\Psi\rangle_{RABC}}$ is a min (this can be formally justified using standard continuity arguments) and is achieved by $(T, U_{BCT}, \sigma'_T, \sigma_{CT}, \kappa_{RBCT})$ along with the conditions,

$$\rho_{RBCT} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (I_R \otimes U_{BCT})\kappa_{RBCT}(I_R \otimes U^{\dagger}_{BCT}) \in \mathcal{B}^{\varepsilon}\left(\Psi_{RBC} \otimes \sigma'_T\right), \kappa_{RB} = \Psi_{RB}.$$

Let $k \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathrm{Q}^{\varepsilon}_{|\Psi\rangle_{R,B,AC}}$ and $\delta \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \varepsilon^2/4$. If $k \leq 2\delta$, let $n = 1$, else let $n \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{8 \cdot 2^k \cdot \log(k/\delta)}{\delta^3}$. Consider the state,

$$\mu_{RBF_1\ldots F_n} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n} \kappa_{RBF_j} \otimes \sigma_{F_1} \otimes \ldots \otimes \sigma_{F_{j-1}} \otimes \sigma_{F_{j+1}} \otimes \ldots \otimes \sigma_{F_n},$$

where

$$\forall j \in [n] : F_j \equiv CT, \kappa_{RBF_j} = \kappa_{RBCT} \text{ and } \sigma_{F_j} = \sigma_{CT}.$$

Note that $\kappa_{RB} = \mu_{RB}$. Consider the following purification of $\mu_{RBF_1\ldots F_n}$,

$$\begin{aligned} &|\mu\rangle_{MSE_1\ldots E_nRBF_1\ldots F_n} \\ &\quad\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\sum_{j=1}^{n} |j\rangle_M |\kappa\rangle_{SE_jRBF_j} \otimes |\sigma\rangle_{E_1F_1} \otimes \ldots \otimes |\sigma\rangle_{E_{j-1}F_{j-1}} \otimes |\sigma\rangle_{E_{j+1}F_{j+1}} \otimes \ldots \otimes |\sigma\rangle_{E_nF_n} \end{aligned}$$

Here, $\forall j \in [n] : |\sigma\rangle_{E_jF_j}$ is a purification of σ_{F_j} and $|\kappa\rangle_{SE_jRBF_j}$ is a purification of κ_{RBF_j}. Consider the following protocol $\mathcal{P}_1$.

1. Alice, Bob and Referee start by sharing the state $|\mu\rangle_{MSE_1\ldots E_nRBF_1\ldots F_n}$ between themselves where Alice holds registers $MSE_1\ldots E_n$, Referee holds the register R and Bob holds the registers $BF_1\ldots F_n$.

2. Alice measures the register M and sends the measurement outcome $j \in [n]$ to Bob using $\frac{\log(n)}{2}$ qubits of quantum communication. Alice and Bob employ superdense coding [NC00] using fresh entanglement to achieve this.

3. Alice swaps registers E_j and E_1 and Bob swaps registers F_j and F_1. Note that the joint state on the registers SE_1RBF_1 at this stage is $|\kappa\rangle_{SE_1RBF_1}$.

4. Bob performs the unitary U_{BCT} on registers BF_1. Note that the joint state on the registers RBF_1 at this stage is ρ_{RBCT}.

5. Let $|\Psi\rangle_{RABC} \otimes |\sigma'\rangle_{T'T}$ be a purification of $\Psi_{RBC} \otimes \sigma'_T$. Alice applies an isometry $V : \mathcal{H}_{SE_1} \to \mathcal{H}_{AT'}$, given by Fact 2.3, so that the joint state in the registers $RABCT'T$ becomes $|\rho\rangle_{RABCT'T}$ (a purification of ρ_{RBCT}) such that:

$$\mathrm{F}^2(|\rho\rangle\langle\rho|_{RABCT'T}, |\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi|_{RABC} \otimes |\sigma'\rangle\langle\sigma'|_{T'T}) = \mathrm{F}^2(\rho_{RBCT}, \Psi_{RBC} \otimes \sigma_T) \geq 1 - \varepsilon^2. \tag{5}$$

6. The state $\Phi^1_{RABC} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathrm{Tr}_{T'T} |\rho\rangle\langle\rho|_{RABCT'T}$ is considered the output of the protocol $\mathcal{P}_1$. Eq. (5) and Fact 2.5 imply,

$$\mathrm{F}^2(\Phi^1_{RABC}, |\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi|_{RABC}) \geq 1 - \varepsilon^2. \tag{6}$$

Consider the state,

$$\xi_{RBF_1\ldots F_n} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \Psi_{RB} \otimes \mu_{F_1,F_2\ldots F_n}.$$

Let $|\theta\rangle_{E_1\ldots E_nF_1\ldots F_n}$ be a purification of $\mu_{F_1,F_2\ldots F_n}$. Let

$$|\xi\rangle_{RABCE_1\ldots E_nF_1\ldots F_n} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} |\Psi\rangle_{RABC} \otimes |\theta\rangle_{E_1\ldots E_nF_1\ldots F_n}.$$

Using Lemma 3.1 and choice of n we have,

$$\mathrm{F}^2(\kappa_{RB} \otimes \mu_{F_1,F_2\ldots F_n}, \mu_{RBF_1\ldots F_n}) \geq 1 - \varepsilon^2.$$

Recall that $\Psi_{RB} = \kappa_{RB}$. Using the triangle inequality for purified distance (Fact 2.2), we get

$$\begin{aligned}\sqrt{1 - \mathrm{F}^2(\Psi_{RB} \otimes \mu_{F_1,F_2\ldots F_n}, \mu_{RBF_1\ldots F_n})} &\leq \sqrt{1 - \mathrm{F}^2(\kappa_{RB} \otimes \mu_{F_1,F_2\ldots F_n}, \mu_{RBF_1\ldots F_n})} + \sqrt{1 - \mathrm{F}^2(\kappa_{RB}, \Psi_{RB})} \\ &\leq \varepsilon.\end{aligned}$$

This implies

$$\mathrm{F}^2(\xi_{RBF_1\ldots F_n}, \mu_{RBF_1\ldots F_n}) = \mathrm{F}^2(\Psi_{RB} \otimes \mu_{F_1,F_2\ldots F_n}, \mu_{RBF_1\ldots F_n}) \geq 1 - \varepsilon^2.$$

Let $|\xi'\rangle_{MSE_1\ldots E_nRBF_1\ldots F_n}$ be a purification of $\xi_{RBF_1\ldots F_n}$ (guaranteed by Fact 2.3) such that,

$$\mathrm{F}^2(|\xi'\rangle\langle\xi'|_{MSE_1\ldots E_nRBF_1\ldots F_n}, |\mu\rangle\langle\mu|_{MSE_1\ldots E_nRBF_1\ldots F_n}) = \mathrm{F}^2(\xi_{RBF_1\ldots F_n}, \mu_{RBF_1\ldots F_n}) \geq 1 - \varepsilon^2.$$

Let $V' : \mathcal{H}_{ACE_1\ldots E_n} \to \mathcal{H}_{MSE_1\ldots E_n}$ be an isometry (guaranteed by Fact 2.3) such that,

$$V' |\xi\rangle_{RABCE_1\ldots E_nF_1\ldots F_n} = |\xi'\rangle_{MSE_1\ldots E_nRBF_1\ldots F_n}.$$

Consider the following protocol $\mathcal{P}$.

1. Alice, Bob and Referee start by sharing the state $|\xi\rangle_{RABCE_1\ldots E_nF_1\ldots F_n}$ between themselves where Alice holds registers $ACE_1\ldots E_n$, Referee holds the register R and Bob holds the registers $BF_1\ldots F_n$. Note that $|\Psi\rangle_{RABC}$ is provided as input to the protocol and $|\theta\rangle_{E_1\ldots E_nF_1\ldots F_n}$ is additional shared entanglement between Alice and Bob.

2. Alice applies isometry V' to obtain state $|\xi'\rangle_{MSE_1\ldots E_nRBF_1\ldots F_n}$, where Alice holds registers $MSE_1\ldots E_n$, Referee holds the register R and Bob holds the registers $BF_1\ldots F_n$.

3. Alice and Bob simulate protocol $\mathcal{P}_1$ from Step 2. onwards.

Let Φ_{RABC} be the output of protocol $\mathcal{P}$. Since quantum maps (the entire protocol $\mathcal{P}_1$ can be viewed as a quantum map from input to output) do not decrease fidelity (Fact 2.5), we have,

$$\mathrm{F}^2(\Phi_{RABC}, \Phi^1_{RABC}) \geq \mathrm{F}^2(|\xi'\rangle\langle\xi'|_{MSE_1\ldots E_nRBF_1\ldots F_n}, |\mu\rangle\langle\mu|_{MSE_1\ldots E_nRBF_1\ldots F_n}) \geq 1-\varepsilon^2. \quad (7)$$

Combining Eq. 6, Eq. 7 and using triangle inequality for purified distance (Fact 2.2) we have,

$$\mathcal{P}(\Phi_{RABC}, |\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi|_{RABC}) \;\leq\; \mathcal{P}(\Phi_{RABC}, \Phi^1_{RABC}) + \mathcal{P}(\Phi^1_{RABC}, |\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi|_{RABC}) \leq 2\varepsilon.$$

This implies $\Phi_{RABC} \in \mathcal{B}^{2\varepsilon}(|\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi|_{RABC})$.

If $\mathrm{Q}^{\varepsilon}_{|\Psi\rangle_{R,B,AC}} \leq \varepsilon^2/2$, we have $n=1$ and hence there is no communication from Alice to Bob in $\mathcal{P}$. Otherwise the number of qubits communicated by Alice to Bob in $\mathcal{P}$ is upper bounded by:

$$\frac{\log(n)}{2} \leq \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{Q}^{\varepsilon}_{|\Psi\rangle_{RABC}} + \log\log\left(\frac{4}{\varepsilon^2}\mathrm{Q}^{\varepsilon}_{|\Psi\rangle_{RABC}}\right) + \mathcal{O}\left(\log\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\right)\right).$$

□

Lower bound

We prove the following lower bound.

Theorem 4.3 (Lower bound)**.** *Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and $|\Psi\rangle_{RABC}$ be a pure state. Let $\mathcal{Q}$ be an entanglement-assisted one-way protocol (with communication from* Alice *to* Bob*), which takes as input $|\Psi\rangle_{RABC}$ shared between three parties* Referee (R), Bob (B) *and* Alice (AC) *and outputs a state Φ_{RABC} shared between* Referee (R), Bob (BC) *and* Alice (A) *such that $\Phi_{RABC} \in \mathcal{B}^{\varepsilon}(\Psi_{RABC})$. The number of qubits communicated by* Alice *to* Bob *in $\mathcal{Q}$ is lower bounded by:*

$$\frac{1}{2}\mathrm{Q}^{\varepsilon}_{|\Psi\rangle_{RABC}}.$$

Proof. Protocol $\mathcal{Q}$ can be written as follows:

1. Alice and Bob get as input $|\Psi\rangle_{RABC}$ shared between Alice (AC), Referee (R) and Bob (B). In addition Alice and Bob share pure state $|\theta\rangle_{S_AS_B}$ where register S_A is held by Alice and register S_B is held by Bob.

2. Alice applies a unitary U_{ACS_A} on the registers ACS_A. Let $\kappa_{RMAT_ABS_B}$ be the joint state at this stage shared between Alice (MAT_A), Referee (R) and Bob (BS_B), where $MT_A \equiv CS_A$. Note that $\kappa_{RB} = \Psi_{RB}$ and $\kappa_{RBS_B} = \Psi_{RB} \otimes \theta_{S_B}$.

3. Alice sends the message register M to Bob.

4. Bob applies a unitary V_{BS_BM} on the registers BS_BM. Let $\Phi_{RABCT_AT_B}$ be the joint state at this stage shared between Alice (AT_A), Referee (R) and Bob (BCT_B) where $S_BM \equiv CT_B$.

5. The state Φ_{RABC} is considered the output of the protocol $\mathcal{Q}$.

Using Fact 2.9, we know that there exists a state ω_M, such that:

$$2\log|M| \geq \mathrm{D}_{\max}(\kappa_{RBS_BM}\|\kappa_{RBS_B}\otimes\omega_M) = \mathrm{D}_{\max}(\kappa_{RBS_BM}\|\Psi_{RB}\otimes\theta_{S_B}\otimes\omega_M)\,. \tag{8}$$

We have $\mathrm{F}^2(\Phi_{RABC}, |\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi|_{RABC}) \geq 1-\varepsilon^2$ and $|\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi|_{RABC}$ is a pure state. From Lemma 2.15 and Fact 2.5 we get a state σ'_{T_B} such that,

$$\mathrm{F}^2(\Phi_{RBCT_B}, \Psi_{RBC}\otimes\sigma'_{T_B}) \geq 1-\varepsilon^2.$$

We have,

$$\Phi_{RBCT_B} = (I_R\otimes V_{BS_BM})\kappa_{RBS_BM}(I_R\otimes V^\dagger_{BS_BM}), \kappa_{RB} = \Psi_{RB}. \tag{9}$$

Recall that $S_BM \equiv CT_B$. Define $\sigma_{CT_B} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \theta_{S_B}\otimes\omega_M$. Eq. (8) and Eq. (9) imply,

$$2\log|M| \geq \mathrm{D}_{\max}(\kappa_{RBCT_B}\|\Psi_{RB}\otimes\sigma_{CT_B})\,,$$

with the conditions

$$\mathrm{F}^2(\Phi_{RBCT_B}, \Psi_{RBC}\otimes\sigma'_{T_B}) > 1-\varepsilon^2, \Phi_{RBCT_B} = (I_R\otimes V_{BCT_B})\kappa_{RBCT_B}(I_R\otimes V^\dagger_{BCT_B}), \kappa_{RB} = \Psi_{RB}.$$

From above and the definition of $Q^\varepsilon_{|\Psi\rangle_{RABC}}$ we conclude

$$\log|M| \geq \frac{1}{2}Q^\varepsilon_{|\Psi\rangle_{RABC}}.$$

□

5 Communication bounds on state splitting and state merging

In this section, we describe near optimal bound for communication cost of state splitting and state merging protocols.

State splitting

We show the following lemma, which along with Theorem 4.2 and Theorem 4.3 immediately implies Corollary 1.2.

Lemma 5.1. *Assume B is a trivial register* ($\dim(B) = 1$). *Then* $\mathrm{Q}^\varepsilon_{|\Psi\rangle_{RAC}} = \mathrm{I}^\varepsilon_{\max}(R:C)_{\Psi_{RC}}$.

Proof. In the calculations below the condition

$$\rho_{RCT} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (I_R \otimes U_{CT})\kappa_{RCT}(I_R \otimes U_{CT}^\dagger) \in \mathcal{B}^\varepsilon\left(\Psi_{RC} \otimes \sigma'_T\right)$$

holds. Note that the condition $\kappa_R \in \mathcal{B}^\varepsilon(\Psi_R)$ is now redundant (is implied by above using $\rho_R = \kappa_R$ and Fact 2.5). Consider,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{Q}^\varepsilon_{|\Psi\rangle_{RAC}} &= \inf_{T,U_{CT},\sigma_{CT},\sigma'_T,\kappa_{RCT}} \mathrm{D}_{\max}(\kappa_{RCT} \| \kappa_R \otimes \sigma_{CT}) \\
&= \inf_{T,U_{CT},\sigma_{CT},\sigma'_T,\kappa_{RCT}} \mathrm{D}_{\max}\Big((I_R \otimes U_{CT}^\dagger)\rho_{RCT}(I_R \otimes U_{CT}) \Big\| \kappa_R \otimes \sigma_{CT}\Big) \\
&= \inf_{T,U_{CT},\sigma_{CT},\sigma'_T,\kappa_{RCT}} \mathrm{D}_{\max}\Big(\rho_{RCT} \Big\| \kappa_R \otimes U_{CT}\sigma_{CT}U_{CT}^\dagger\Big) \\
&= \inf_{T,\mu_{CT},\sigma'_T,\kappa_{RCT}} \mathrm{D}_{\max}(\rho_{RCT} \| \kappa_R \otimes \mu_{CT}) \quad (\text{with } \mu_{CT} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} U_{CT}\sigma_{CT}U_{CT}^\dagger) \\
&= \inf_{T,\sigma'_T,\rho_{RCT} \in \mathcal{B}^\varepsilon(\Psi_{RC}\otimes\sigma'_T)} \mathrm{I}_{\max}(R:CT)_{\rho_{RCT}} \quad (\text{using } \rho_R = \kappa_R) \\
&= \inf_{T,\sigma'_T} \mathrm{I}^\varepsilon_{\max}(R:CT)_{\Psi_{RC}\otimes\sigma'_T}\,.
\end{aligned}$$

Now,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{I}^\varepsilon_{\max}(R:C)_{\Psi_{RC}} &\geq \inf_{T,\sigma'_T} \mathrm{I}^\varepsilon_{\max}(R:CT)_{\Psi_{RC}\otimes\sigma'_T} \quad (\text{by setting } T \text{ to be trivial register}) \\
&= \inf_{T,\sigma'_T,\rho_{RCT} \in \mathcal{B}^\varepsilon(\Psi_{RC}\otimes\sigma'_T)} \mathrm{I}_{\max}(R:CT)_{\rho_{RCT}} \\
&\geq \inf_{\rho_{RC} \in \mathcal{B}^\varepsilon(\Psi_{RC})} \mathrm{I}_{\max}(R:C)_{\rho_{RC}} \quad (\text{using Fact 2.10}) \\
&= \mathrm{I}^\varepsilon_{\max}(R:C)_{\Psi_{RC}}\,.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\mathrm{Q}^\varepsilon_{|\Psi\rangle_{RAC}} = \inf_{T,\sigma'_T} \mathrm{I}^\varepsilon_{\max}(R:CT)_{\Psi_{RC}\otimes\sigma'_T} = \mathrm{I}^\varepsilon_{\max}(R:C)_{\Psi_{RC}}\,.$$

□

State merging

In case of state merging, the register A is trivial. It has been noted in [BCR11] that state merging can be viewed as the 'time reversed' version of state splitting, and the optimal cost of communication is same as the bound for state splitting with A replaced by B. The following lemma formally states the same. This along with Theorem 4.2, Theorem 4.3 and Corollary 1.2 immediately imply Corollary 1.3.

Lemma 5.2 ([BCR11])**.** *Fix an $\varepsilon > 0$. Consider an entanglement assisted state splitting protocol $\mathcal{P}$ that starts with a state Ψ_{RAC}, with (AC) on* Alice*'s side and R on* Referee*'s side, and outputs a state Φ_{RAC}, with C on* Bob*'s side, such that $\Phi_{RAC} \in \mathcal{B}^\varepsilon(\Psi_{RAC})$. Let q qubits be communicated between* Alice *and* Bob *in $\mathcal{P}$. There exists an entanglement assisted one-way state merging protocol $\mathcal{Q}$ that starts with the state Ψ_{RBC} ($B \equiv A$), with C on* Alice*'s side and B on* Bob*'s side, and outputs a state Φ'_{RBC}, with (BC) on* Bob*'s side, such that $\Phi'_{RBC} \in \mathcal{B}^\varepsilon(\Psi_{RBC})$. There are q qubits communicated between* Alice *and* Bob *in $\mathcal{Q}$.*

Converse of the above holds as well. For every entanglement assisted state merging protocol $\mathcal{Q}$ with quantum communication cost q qubits, there exists an entanglement assisted state splitting protocol $\mathcal{P}$ with quantum communication cost q qubits.

Proof. Let the protocol $\mathcal{P}$ start with the overall pure state $\Psi_{RAC} \otimes \mu_E$, where the register E include shared entanglement and other ancilla registers used by $\mathcal{P}$. Let the final pure state of the protocol be Φ_{RACE}, with $\mathrm{F}^2(\Phi_{RAC}, \Psi_{RAC}) \geq 1 - \varepsilon^2$. To describe the state merging protocol, we now relabel register A with B. Since protocol $\mathcal{P}$ is a collection of unitary operations (which are invertible), it implies that there exists a protocol $\mathcal{P}'$ (which is protocol $\mathcal{P}$ time reversed) that starts with the state Φ_{RBCE}, and leads to the state $\Psi_{RBC} \otimes \mu_E$ with $\mathrm{F}^2(\Psi_{RBC}, \Phi_{RBC}) \geq 1 - \varepsilon^2$. From Fact 2.3, there exists a pure state μ'_E that satisfies

$$\mathrm{F}^2(\Psi_{RBC} \otimes \mu'_E, \Phi_{RBCE}) = \mathrm{F}^2(\Psi_{RBC}, \Phi_{RBC}) \geq 1 - \varepsilon^2.$$

Let $\mathcal{Q}$ be the protocol that starts with the pure state $\Psi_{RBC} \otimes \mu'_E$, and then does exactly the same as protocol $\mathcal{P}'$. Let the overall state at the end of $\mathcal{Q}$ be Φ'_{RBCE}. Then,

$$\mathrm{F}^2(\Psi_{RBC}, \Phi'_{RBC}) \geq \mathrm{F}^2(\Psi_{RBC} \otimes \mu_E, \Phi'_{RBCE}) = \mathrm{F}^2(\Phi_{RBCE}, \Psi_{RBC} \otimes \mu'_E)) \geq 1 - \varepsilon^2.$$

It is clear that the communication between Alice and Bob is the same in $\mathcal{P}$ and $\mathcal{Q}$.

The converse can be proved using similar arguments. □

6 Relation to other protocols and asymptotic setting

The protocols of [BCT14, DHO14] can roughly be described as follows. By decoupling arguments, there exists a unitary U_C that acts on system C and divides it into 3 parts: C_1, C_2, C_3 such that C_1 is 'almost' decoupled from BR and C_2 is 'almost' decoupled from AR. To have a simpler picture, lets assume that this decoupling is exact. Since $\Psi_{C_1} \otimes \Psi_{BR}$ is purified in AC_2C_3, Alice applies an isometry $V : \mathcal{H}_{AC_2C_3} \to \mathcal{H}_{SC'_1}$ to purify Ψ_{C_1} on a separate register C'_1 and purify Ψ_{BR} on a separate register S. Alice and Bob share an entangled pure state $\theta_{E_1E'_1}$ on registers $E_1E'_1$, with $E_1 \equiv C_1$ on Bob's side, such that $\theta_{E_1} = \Psi_{C_1}$. Alice swaps E'_1 and C'_1 and applies the inverse V^{-1} to restore the original system with C_1 on Bob's side. Alice then transfers C_3 to Bob. Now, $\Psi_{C_2} \otimes \Psi_{AR}$ is purified in BC_1C_3. Bob prepares pure state $\alpha_{D_2D'_2}$, with $\alpha_{D_2} = \Psi_{C_2}$, $D_2 \equiv C_2$ and D'_2 purifying the state α_{D_2}. Bob applies a unitary $U_{BCT} : \mathcal{H}_{BC_1C_3D_2D'_2} \to \mathcal{H}_{C'_2BC}$ ($C'_2 \equiv D'_2$) so that the joint state in the registers $RABCC_2C'_2$ is $\Phi_{C_2C'_2} \otimes \Psi_{RABC}$ (where $\Phi_{C_2C'_2}$ is a purification of Ψ_{C_2}).

In this setting consider the quantities involved in definition of $\mathrm{Q}^0_{|\Psi\rangle_{RABC}}$. Let $T \equiv C'_2$ and define,

$$\kappa_{RBCT} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \Psi_{RBC_1C_3} \otimes \alpha_{D_2D'_2}, \sigma'_T = \Phi_{C'_2}.$$

Recall that C_1 was decoupled from RB on application of U_C. Hence (using Fact 2.9),

$$\mathrm{I}_{\max}(RB : CT)_{\kappa_{RBCT}} = \mathrm{I}_{\max}(RB : C_1D_2C_3D'_2)_{\Psi_{RBC_1C_3} \otimes \alpha_{D_2D'_2}} = \mathrm{I}_{\max}(RB : C_3)_{\Psi_{RBC_3}} \leq 2 \log |C_3|.$$

Also, the following holds:

$$\mathrm{I}(B : CT)_{\kappa_{BCT}} = \mathrm{I}(RB : CT)_{\kappa_{RBCT}} - \mathrm{I}(R : C|B)_{\Psi_{RBC}} \leq 2 \log |C_3| - \mathrm{I}(R : C|B)_{\Psi_{RBC}}.$$

In the actual protocol the decoupling operation is not perfect. In this case, we define κ_{RBCT} to be the state in Bob's registers just before his unitary and U_{BCT} to be the unitary that he applies. The correctness of the protocol ensures that $\mathrm{Q}^{\varepsilon}_{|\Psi\rangle_{RABC}} \leq 2 \log |C_3|$.

Using above mentioned results, we have the following lemma

Lemma 6.1 ([BCT14, Tou14, DHO14])**.**

$$\frac{1}{2}\mathrm{Q}^{\varepsilon}_{\Psi_{RABC}} \leq \frac{49}{2\varepsilon^2}\mathrm{I}(R:C|B) + \frac{98}{2\varepsilon^2} + 15$$

In the asymptotic setting, decoupling argument was used to prove the following lemma.

Lemma 6.2 ([DY08, YD09])**.** *Let ε be an error parameter, n be an integer and $|\Psi\rangle_{RABC}$ be a pure state. There exists an entanglement-assisted one-way protocol $\mathcal{P}$, which takes as input $|\Psi\rangle^{\otimes n}_{RABC}$ shared between three parties* Referee *(R),* Bob *(B) and* Alice *(AC) and outputs a state $\Phi^{\otimes n}_{RABC}$ shared between* Referee *(R),* Bob *(BC) and* Alice *(A) such that $\Phi^{\otimes n}_{RABC} \in \mathcal{B}^{\varepsilon}\left(\Psi^{\otimes n}_{RABC}\right)$. Taking the limit in the order $n \to \infty$ and then $\varepsilon \to 0$, the communication cost of $\mathcal{P}$ per copy of input is exactly $\frac{1}{2}\mathrm{I}(R:C|B)_{\Psi_{RBC}}$.*

This allows us to state the following lemma,

Lemma 6.3.

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0}\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}\mathrm{Q}^{\varepsilon}_{\Psi^{\otimes n}_{RABC}} = \mathrm{I}(R:C|B)_{\Psi_{RBC}}$$

Proof. From lemma 6.2 and theorem 4.3, we have that

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0}\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}\mathrm{Q}^{\varepsilon}_{\Psi^{\otimes n}_{RABC}} \leq \mathrm{I}(R:C|B)_{\Psi_{RBC}}$$

From theorem 4.2 and 6.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathrm{I}(R:C|B)_{\Psi_{RBC}} \\
&\qquad \leq \lim_{\varepsilon\to 0}\lim_{n\to\infty}\Big(\frac{1}{n}\mathrm{Q}^{\varepsilon}_{|\Psi\rangle^{\otimes n}_{RABC}} + \frac{1}{n}\log\log\left(\frac{4}{\varepsilon^2}\mathrm{Q}^{\varepsilon}_{|\Psi\rangle^{\otimes n}_{RABC}}\right) + \frac{1}{n}\mathcal{O}\left(\log\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\right)\right)\Big) \\
&\qquad = \lim_{\varepsilon\to 0}\lim_{n\to\infty}\Big(\frac{1}{n}\mathrm{Q}^{\varepsilon}_{|\Psi\rangle^{\otimes n}_{RABC}} + \frac{1}{n}\log\log\left(\frac{4}{\varepsilon^2}\mathrm{Q}^{\varepsilon}_{|\Psi\rangle^{\otimes n}_{RABC}}\right)\Big) \\
&\qquad \leq \lim_{\varepsilon\to 0}\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}\mathrm{Q}^{\varepsilon}_{|\Psi\rangle^{\otimes n}_{RABC}} \quad (\text{since } \mathrm{Q}^{\varepsilon}_{|\Psi\rangle^{\otimes n}_{RABC}} < n|C|)
\end{aligned}$$

□

7 Recovery of quantum states

In this section, we relate $\mathrm{Q}^{\varepsilon}_{\Psi_{RABC}}$ to the recently studied problem of recovering a quantum state (see [FR14, SW14, FGB14, MB15]).

We have the following main claim.

Claim 7.1. $\mathrm{Q}^{\varepsilon}_{\Psi_{RABC}} \geq -2\log \mathrm{F}(R:C|B)_{\Psi_{RBC}} + \log(1-\varepsilon^2)$.

Proof. Let $(I_R \otimes U_{BCT})\kappa_{RBCT}(I_R \otimes U_{BCT}^\dagger) \in \mathcal{B}^\varepsilon(\Psi_{RBC} \otimes \sigma'_T)\,, \kappa_{RB} = \Psi_{RB}$. Consider,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{Q}^\varepsilon_{\Psi_{RABC}} &= \inf_{T,U_{BCT},\sigma'_T,\sigma_{CT}} \mathrm{D}_{\max}(\kappa_{RBCT} \| \Psi_{RB} \otimes \sigma_{CT}) \\
&\geq \inf_{T,U_{BCT},\sigma'_T,\sigma_{CT}} -2\log \mathrm{F}(U_{BCT}^\dagger(\Psi_{RBC} \otimes \sigma'_T)U_{BCT}, \kappa_{RB} \otimes \sigma_{CT}) \\
&+ 2\log(F(U_{BCT}^\dagger(\Psi_{RBC} \otimes \sigma'_T)U_{BCT}, \kappa_{RBCT})) \quad \text{(using Fact 2.6)} \\
&\geq \inf_{T,U_{BCT},\sigma'_T,\sigma_{CT}} -2\log \mathrm{F}(\Psi_{RBC} \otimes \sigma'_T, (I_R \otimes U_{BCT}^\dagger)\Psi_{RB} \otimes \sigma_{CT}(I_R \otimes U_{BCT})) + \log(1-\varepsilon^2) \\
&\geq \inf_{T,U_{BCT},\sigma_{CT}} -2\log \mathrm{F}(\Psi_{RBC}, \mathrm{Tr}_T((I_R \otimes U_{BCT}^\dagger)\Psi_{RB} \otimes \sigma_{CT}(I_R \otimes U_{BCT}))) \\
&+ \log(1-\varepsilon^2) \quad \text{(using Fact 2.5)} \\
&\geq \inf_{\mathcal{E}:B\to BC} -2\log \mathrm{F}(\Psi_{RBC}, \mathcal{E}(\Psi_{RB})) + \log(1-\varepsilon^2) \quad \text{(using Fact 2.4)} \\
&= -2\log \mathrm{F}(R:C|B)_{\Psi_{RBC}} + \log(1-\varepsilon^2).
\end{aligned}$$

Note that first inequality in the proof has been adapted from [FGB14, MB15]. □

We define an another quantity closely related to $\mathrm{Q}^\varepsilon_{\Psi_{RABC}}$.

Definition 7.2. Let $\varepsilon \geq 0$. Define,

$$\mathrm{Q}'^{\varepsilon}_{|\Psi\rangle_{RABC}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \inf_{T,\sigma'_T,U_{BCT},\gamma'_{RBCT} \in \mathcal{B}^\varepsilon(\gamma_{RBCT})} \mathrm{I}(RB:CT)_{\gamma'_{RBCT}}\,,$$

along with the condition $\gamma_{RB} = \Psi_{RB}$, where $\gamma_{RBCT} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (I_R \otimes U_{BCT}^\dagger)(\Psi_{RBC} \otimes \sigma'_T)(I_R \otimes U_{BCT})$.

The following claim addresses a tighter conjecture in terms of relative entropy, put forward in reference [KL15].

Claim 7.3.

$$\inf_{\mathcal{E}:B\to BC} \mathrm{D}(\Psi_{RBC} \| \mathcal{E}(\Psi_{RB})) \leq \mathrm{I}(R:C|B)_{\Psi_{RBC}} + \inf_{T,\sigma'_T,U_{BCT}} \mathrm{I}(B:CT)_{\gamma_{BCT}}\,.$$

Proof. Using 2.5, we have:

$$\mathrm{Q}'^{0}_{|\Psi\rangle_{RABC}} = \inf_{T,\sigma'_T,U_{BCT},\gamma_{RBCT}} \mathrm{D}\Big(\Psi_{RBC} \otimes \sigma'_T \Big\| U_{BCT}(\Psi_{RB} \otimes \sigma_{CT})U^\dagger BCT\Big) \geq \inf_{\mathcal{E}:B\to BC} \mathrm{D}(\Psi_{RBC} \| \mathcal{E}(\Psi_{RB}))\,.$$

Claim follows from below:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{Q}'^{0}_{|\Psi\rangle_{RABC}} &= \inf_{T,\sigma'_T,U_{BCT}} \mathrm{I}(RB:CT)_{\gamma_{RBCT}} \\
&= \inf_{T,\sigma'_T,U_{BCT}} \mathrm{I}(R:CT|B)_{\gamma_{RBCT}} + \mathrm{I}(B:CT)_{\gamma_{BCT}} \\
&= \mathrm{I}(R:C|B)_{\Psi_{RBC}} + \inf_{T,\sigma'_T,U_{BCT}} \mathrm{I}(B:CT)_{\gamma_{BCT}}\,.
\end{aligned}$$

The last equality holds since $\mathrm{I}(R:BCT)_{\gamma_{RBCT}} = \mathrm{I}(R:BC)_{\Psi_{RBC}}$ and $\mathrm{I}(R:B)_{\gamma_{RB}} = \mathrm{I}(R:B)_{\Psi_{RB}}$, which implies $\mathrm{I}(R:C|B)_{\Psi_{RBC}} = \mathrm{I}(R:CT|B)_{\gamma_{RBCT}}$.

□

Thus, an interesting question is to find a register T and a unitary U_{BCT} which when applied to $\Psi_{RBC} \otimes \sigma'_T$, decouples B from CT as much as possible in the resulting state γ_{RBCT}, while keeping the marginal state in the registers RB unchanged, that is, $\gamma_{RB} = \Psi_{RB}$.

Finally, as a corollary to lemma 6.1 we show an another bound on cost of recovering a quantum state, stated in terms of max-relative entropy.

Corollary 7.4. *Given a state Ψ_{RBC} and an error parameter $\varepsilon > 0$, we have*

$$\inf_{\mathcal{E}:B\to BC,\kappa_{RB},\gamma_{RBC}} \mathrm{D}_{\max}(\gamma_{RBC}\|\mathcal{E}(\kappa_{RB})) \leq \frac{49}{2\varepsilon^2}\mathrm{I}(R:C|B) + \frac{98}{2\varepsilon^2} + 15$$

where, $\kappa_{RB} \in \mathcal{B}^{\varepsilon}(\Psi_{RB})$ and $\gamma_{RBC} \in \mathcal{B}^{\varepsilon}(\Psi_{RBC})$.

Proof. Let $\gamma_{RBCT} \in \mathcal{B}^{\varepsilon}(\Psi_{RBC} \otimes \sigma'_T)$, $\kappa_{RB} \in \mathcal{B}^{\varepsilon}(\Psi_{RB})$. Consider,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Q}^{\varepsilon}_{\Psi_{RABC}} &= \inf_{T,U_{BCT},\gamma_{RBCT},\kappa_{RB},\sigma_{CT}} \mathrm{D}_{\max}\left(\gamma_{RBCT}\middle\|U_{BCT}(\kappa_{RB}\otimes\sigma_{CT})U^{\dagger}_{BCT}\right) \\ &\geq \inf_{\mathcal{E}:B\to BC,\gamma_{RBCT},\kappa_{RB}} \mathrm{D}_{\max}(\gamma_{RBC}\|\mathcal{E}(\kappa_{RB})) \quad \text{(using Facts 2.5 and 2.4)} \end{aligned}$$

□

Conclusion and open questions

In this work we have proposed a new information theoretic quantity and exhibited that it (nearly) tightly captures the worst case entanglement-assisted one-way quantum communication complexity of the quantum state redistribution task and the sub-tasks quantum state splitting and quantum state merging. A key technical tool that we use is a convex-split lemma which may be of independent interest. Some natural questions that arise are:

1. Can we understand the quantity $Q^{\varepsilon}_{|\Psi\rangle_{RABC}}$ better? Can we relate it to other information theoretic quantities of interest studied in the literature, for example in recent works [BSW14, BCT14, FR14, SW14]? Can we put an upper bound on the size of register T in the definition of $Q^{\varepsilon}_{|\Psi\rangle_{RABC}}$?
2. Can the gap between our upper and lower bounds be further reduced? Can the dependence of communication on ε be improved?
3. Our protocol uses a lot of entanglement. Can we be simultaneously (nearly) optimal in communication and entanglement used?
4. What happens if we consider expected communication instead of worst case communication?
5. What is the state σ'_T and unitary U_{BCT}, that achieves the optimal decoupling between B and CT (as discussed in Section 7)?
6. Can our bounds be used to derive tighter direct-sum results for multi-round quantum communication complexity?

Acknowledgment

We thank Nilanjana Datta, Marco Tomamichel and Mark M. Wilde for helpful comments on a previous version of this paper and also for pointing many useful references. We thank Priyanka Mukhopadhyay for helpful discussions.

This work is supported by the Singapore Ministry of Education Tier 3 Grant and also the Core Grants of the Center for Quantum Technologies (CQT), Singapore.

References

[ADHW09] Anura Abeyesinghe, Igor Devetak, Patrick Hayden, and Andreas Winter. The mother of all protocols: Restructuring quantum information's family tree. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London*, A:2537–2563, 2009.

[AJM+14] Anurag Anshu, Rahul Jain, Priyanka Mukhopadhyay, Ala Shayeghi, and Penghui Yao. A new operational interpretation of relative entropy and trace distance between quantum states. http://arxiv.org/abs/1404.1366, 2014.

[BCR11] Mario Berta, Matthias Christandl, and Renato Renner. The Quantum Reverse Shannon Theorem based on one-shot information theory. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 306:579–615, 2011.

[BCT14] Mario Berta, Matthias Christandl, and Dave Touchette. Smooth entropy bounds on one-shot quantum state redistribution. 2014. http://arxiv.org/abs/1409.4338.

[BD10] Francesco Buscemi and Nilanjana Datta. The quantum capacity of channels with arbitrarily correlated noise. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 56:1447–1460, 2010.

[Ber09] Mario Berta. Single-shot quantum state merging, 2009. Master's thesis, ETH Zurich.

[BRWW09] Mario Berta, Renato Renner, Andreas Winter, and Jürg Wullschleger. One-shot source coding. Unpublished notes, 2009.

[BSW14] Mario Berta, Kaushik P. Seshadreesan, and Mark M. Wilde. Renyi generalizations of the conditional quantum mutual information. 2014.

[CT91] Thomas M. Cover and Joy A. Thomas. *Elements of information theory*. Wiley Series in Telecommunications. John Wiley & Sons, New York, NY, USA, 1991.

[Dat09] Nilanjana Datta. Min- and max- relative entropies and a new entanglement monotone. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 55:2816–2826, 2009.

[DBWR14] Frédéric Dupuis, Mario Berta, Jürg Wullschleger, and Renato Renner. One-shot decoupling. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 328, 2014.

[DCHR78] D. Dacunha-Castelle, H. Heyer, and B. Roynette. Ecole d'Eté de Probabilités de Saint-Flour VII. *Lecture Notes in Mathematics, Springer-Verlag*, 678, 1978.

[DH11] Nilanjana Datta and Min-Hsiu Hsieh. The apex of the family tree of protocols: optimal rates and resource inequalities. *New Journal of Physics*, 13, 2011.

[DHO14] Nilanjana Datta, Min-Hsiu Hsieh, and Jonathan Oppenheim. An upper bound on the second order asymptotic expansion for the quantum communication cost of state redistribution. http://arxiv.org/abs/1409.4352, 2014.

[Dup10] Frédéric Dupuis. The decoupling approach to quantum information theory, 2010. PhD Thesis, Université de Montréal.

[DY08] Igor Devetak and Jon Yard. Exact cost of redistributing multipartite quantum states. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 100, 2008.

[FGB14] Jonathan Oppenheim Sergii Strelchuk Fernando G.S.L. Brandao, Aram W. Harrow. Quantum conditional mutual information, reconstructed states, and state redistribution. http://arxiv.org/abs/1411.4921, 2014.

[FR14] Omar Fawzi and Renato Renner. Quantum conditional mutual information and approximate Markov chains. http://arxiv.org/abs/1410.0664, 2014.

[HOW07] Michał Horodecki, Jonathan Oppenheim, and Andreas Winter. Quantum state merging and negative information. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 269:107–136, 2007.

[JRS02] Rahul Jain, Jaikumar Radhakrishnan, and Pranab Sen. Privacy and interaction in quantum communication complexity and a theorem about the relative entropy of quantum states. In *Proceedings of the 43rd Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, FOCS '02, pages 429–438, Washington, DC, USA, 2002. IEEE Computer Society.

[JRS05] Rahul Jain, Jaikumar Radhakrishnan, and Pranab Sen. Prior entanglement, message compression and privacy in quantum communication. In *Proceedings of the 20th Annual IEEE Conference on Computational Complexity*, pages 285–296, Washington, DC, USA, 2005. IEEE Computer Society.

[JRS08] Rahul Jain, Jaikumar Radhakrishnan, and Pranab Sen. Optimal direct sum and privacy trade-off results for quantum and classical communication complexity. http://arxiv.org/abs/0807.1267, 2008.

[KL15] Andreas Winter Ke Li. Squashed entanglement, k-extendibility, quantum markov chains, and recovery maps. http://arxiv.org/abs/1410.4184, 2015.

[LD09] Zhicheng Luo and Igor Devetak. Channel simulation with quantum side information. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 55:1331–1342, 2009.

[MB15] Marco Tomamichel Mario Berta. The fidelity of recovery is multiplicative. http://arxiv.org/abs/1502.07973, 2015.

[NC00] Michael A. Nielsen and Isaac L. Chuang. *Quantum computation and quantum information*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 2000.

[Opp08] Jonathan Oppenheim. State redistribution as merging: introducing the coherent relay. http://arxiv.org/abs/0805.1065, 2008.

[SW14] Kaushik P. Seshadreesan and Mark M. Wilde. Fidelity of recovery and geometric squashed entanglement. 2014.

[TCR10] Marco Tomamichel, Roger Colbeck, and Renato Renner. Duality between smooth min- and max-entropies. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 56:4674 – 4681, 2010.

[Tom12] Marco Tomamichel. A framework for non-asymptotic quantum information theory, 2012. PhD Thesis, ETH Zurich.

[Tou14] Dave Touchette. Direct sum theorem for bounded round quantum communication complexity, 2014. http://arxiv.org/abs/1409.4391.

[Wat11] John Watrous. Theory of Quantum Information, lecture notes, 2011. https://cs.uwaterloo.ca/ watrous/LectureNotes.html.

[YBW08] Ming-Yong Ye, Yan-Kui Bai, and Z. D. Wang. Quantum state redistribution based on a generalized decoupling. *Physical Review A*, 78, 2008.

[YD09] Jon T. Yard and Igor Devetak. Optimal quantum source coding with quantum side information at the encoder and decoder. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 55:5339–5351, 2009.